REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 12 and 13 remain pending. Applicants have amended claims 12 and 13 to enhance their clarity without changing their scope. Accordingly, entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Knight et al (Knight), U.S. Patent No. 6,289,375. Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 12, which is the independent claim, specifically sets forth two host systems that constitute a hot standby system with respect to each other. Knight does not disclose two host systems that constitute a hot standby system with respect to each other, as claimed. Further, Applicants claim that the host systems each have a table indicating assignment information of each resource and the reserved (spare) resources of the one host system are automatically assigned to

4

the other host system of the hot standby system by writing in the table after the hot standby system is switched. Still further, the claim specifies that the resources include a plurality of instruction processors and a plurality of memory segments. Knight is silent with respect to disclosing or fairly suggesting all of the limitations of the combination set forth in claims 12 and 13, and therefore the anticipation rejection should be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, Response to Arguments section, the Examiner states that Knight discloses that a local agent stores information about "resources" and "primary relationships" and therefore discloses reserving the spare resources of one host system to the other host system of the hot standby system by writing in the table indicating assignment information of each resource. Applicants disagree. There is no teaching by Knight of automatically assigning the reserved (spare) resources in one host system to the other host system of the hot standby system by writing in the table after the hot standby system is switched, as claimed by Applicants in claim 12.

5

Applicants acknowledge that Knight teaches a storage network of storage devices and host adapter devices connected by a communication medium, including hosts and a second network. However, the reference does not fairly suggest or disclose the combination of claims 12 and 13, which include the feature that two host systems constitute a hot standby system with respect to each other. In the present invention, the two host systems are connected to each other and each of host systems has resources including a plurality of instruction processors and a plurality of memory segments. Accordingly, the reference is silent with respect to disclosing two host systems connected to each other in the manner claimed by Applicants.

Knight discloses a local manager that provides data to a manager, as set forth in Col. 18, lines 16-20, and this data is the information of the storage (device) network connected to the hosts, as shown in Figs. 12A-C. However, the reference fails to disclose the feature of a table indicating assignment information of each resource as claimed, i.e. resources including a plurality of instruction processors and a plurality of memory segments.

Further, although Knight teaches that the program segments are loaded into memory 302 from storage (Col. 7, lines 45-46), and that a unique identifier (UID) is assigned to each resource as set forth in the Office Action, this teaching does not suggest the reserved (spare) resources in the one host system are automatically assigned to the one host system by writing in the table when the one host system needs enhancement (claim 13). Further, the reference does not suggest that the reserved (spare) resources are automatically assigned to the other host system of a hot standby system by writing in the table when the other host system requests enhancement, as required by claim 13. Accordingly, claims 12 and 13 are not anticipated by Knight and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn.

7

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

John R. Mattingly
Registration No. 30,293
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: June 8, 2005